DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 510 EC 160 013

TITLE Travel Training for the Handicapped. Final Evaluation Report, 07/01/81 to 09/30/82.
INSTITUTION New York City Public Schools, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 11p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Evaluation; *Transportation; *Travel Training; *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

The final report details accomplishments of a New York City demonstration program to train handicapped students to travel independently on public transportation. It is explained that three major objectives were attained: five new replicators were identified during each of 3 years, replicators followed the program description, and replicators continuing for more than a 1-year period received continued assistance from the demonstrator. Among activities described are dissemination of program information, orientation workshops, staff training for new replicators, and newsletter production. Evaluation activities included discrepancy analyses performed during replicator site visits, measures of the amount and type of technical assistance provided, and examination of project logs to determine communication between demonstrators and current replicators. Type and year of project participation by New York State Schools and school districts are depicted in an appended table. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED233510

SEQUENCE #: 43-082-3510

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

NYC I.D. #: 5001-62-24502

ESEA TITLE IV PART C PROJECT REPORT
1981-82 COVER SHEET

10/4

Name & Address of School District: NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
110 LIVINGSTON STREET
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11201

Congressional Districts: 6-23

Title of Project: TRAVEL TRAINING FOR THE HANDICAPPED

District Enrollment: 943,805 PUBLIC; 309,787 PRIVATE

Curriculum Area: SPECIAL EDUCATION

Target Population: REPLICATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Grade Level(s): DOES NOT APPLY

Type & Number of Direct Participants in Project:

	Public	Private	Total
Pupils	0	0	0
Teachers	0	0	0
Others	0	0	0

Total Number of School Districts Served by Project: 13

At End of this Budget Period, Project
Will Have Been Funded by Title IV-C: 4 YEARS

Fiscal Year Source of Funds: 1982 Budget Period: 07/01/81 to 09/30/82

Type of Project: DEMONSTRATION

Project Contact Person:

ALLISON TUPPER
DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET/ROOM 446
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11201
(212) 522-1570

Evaluation Manager:

ROBERT J. TOBIAS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET/ROOM 736
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11201
(212) 596-5136

EC160013

ABSTRACT

File Number: 43-082-3510

NYC I.D. #: 5001-62-24502

1. School District: NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS 943,805
Popular Name Total Enrollment K-12

2. Title of Project: TRAVEL TRAINING FOR THE HANDICAPPED

3. Type of Grant :DEMONSTRATOR

4. Total Budget :$59,690 5. Pupils Served: DOES NOT APPLY

Needs Statement Summary

School districts need to train handicapped students to travel independently between home and school via public transportation to increase student independence and job placement potential, and reduce the cost of contract bus or van service.

Major Objectives

.Five new replicators will be identified during each of these program years: 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81.
.School districts replicating the program will do so consistent with the program description.
.School districts replicating the program for more than one year will receive continued assistance from the demonstrator.

Major Activities

.Disseminating program information through awareness brochures, conferences, and meetings.
.Assisting potential replicators to make appropriate adaptations of the program.
.Training staff in replicating school districts.
.Helping replicating districts through on-site visits, correspondence, telephone contacts, and meetings.

Major Evaluation Findings

All major objectives were attained. Eighteen letters of intent were submitted; thirteen districts became actual replicators. All new and former replicators received continuous, comprehensive follow-up assistance from the demonstrator.

TRAVEL TRAINING FOR THE HANDICAPPED

I. NEEDS

Pupils who are handicapped frequently need transportation between school and home by means of contract bus or van service. This entails considerable expense for local school districts and limits the pupils' independence and job-placement potential.

Travel Training for the Handicapped is a program which trains mentally retarded and other handicapped students to travel independently by public transportation. Of the 350 students who receive the training in New York City each year, 85 percent become successful travelers; fewer than one percent require retraining after the summer vacation.

II. OBJECTIVES

Objectives proposed for the four project years were as follows:

--a minimum of five new replicators each year will be identified during 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81, as indicated by the submission of a letter of intent and/or an application for replication;

--the adopter districts will faithfully replicate the program, as demonstrated by the attainment of 90 percent concordance in a discrepancy analysis; and

--follow-up and technical assistance will be provided to established replicators (i.e., those that continue to replicate the program for more than one year) as demonstrated by project logs.

III. ACTIVITIES ACCOMPLISHED

During the 1981-82 project year, as it had for the previous three funding years, the program functioned as a demonstration project in the context of the E.S.E.A. Title IV-C statewide demonstration-replication process. Demonstration activities included promoting program awareness, training and assisting current replicators, and providing follow-up assistance for past replicators. In all but the last year the project also secured commitments from future replicators. As a result of these activities 13 New York State school districts have adopted the Travel Training Program over the past four years. (For a complete summary of the involvement of all project participants, see the Appendix.)

Program information was disseminated through brochures, presentations, and conferences. First-level awareness brochures were sent to all Optional Education Program (O.E.P.) representatives and special education directors in the major school districts throughout the state in November 1978, September 1979 and again in September 1980. During these years, the demonstrator also participated in awareness meetings organized by the New York City O.E.P. representative and, in addition, informed all nonpublic schools in New York City serving special education students of the program and conducted awareness meetings for representatives of these schools.

As a result of these dissemination activities, 111 school districts requested additional program information and were sent second-level awareness material. Orientation workshops, at which the Travel Training for the Handicapped Orientation Manual was distributed and reviewed, were conducted for the 38 schools and school districts that showed the greatest interest in replication. Information was presented concerning: the project's cost effec-

tiveness; the instructional materials, supplies, facilities, and personnel required for successful replication; the process of replication; and the role of the demonstrator.

Following the orientation workshops, 18 of the 38 potential replicators decided to adopt the program and filed letters of intent to replicate through an E.S.E.A. Title IV-C replication grant; they were sent grant and budget guidelines and the demonstrator assisted in proposal preparation. In all, 13 districts became replicators; 11 were supported by E.S.E.A. Title IV-C replication grants and two were supported through local funds.

Staff training was initiated by meeting with key administrators. These meetings were followed by individual on-site workshops which focused on the essential program components, instructional techniques, use of resources, and daily reporting and evaluation procedures. The usual training period for each replicator lasted approximately two weeks and culminated in the development of an implementation plan which adapted the program to each district's specific needs. Site visits, telephone conferences, and correspondence between the demonstrator and current replicators were maintained throughout the year. In two cases workshops were provided at the request of the districts and two were conducted for the Title IV-C Technical Assistance Center. In addition, all continuing replicators received follow-up assistance through site visits, telephone contacts, correspondence, and staff training workshops.

During the 1981-82 project year a newsletter was developed for sharing information, ideas, and techniques. Each replicator received copies of the two issues of the publication and a listing of replicators and contact persons throughout the state.

IV. EVALUATION

To determine whether at least five new replicators each were obtained during the 1979-80 and 1980-81 project years (Objective 1), an evaluator from the Office of Educational Evaluation reviewed the letters of intent and grant applications filed by the potential adopters. Eighteen schools and school districts forwarded letters of intent to the demonstrator. Of these, 11 districts filed applications for E.S.E.A. Title IV-C replication grants and two decided to support replication through local funds; four districts that submitted letters of intent failed to file applications; and one applicant did not implement the program. Thus 13 of the 18 districts that submitted letters of intent became actual replicators. Accordingly, Objective 1 was attained.

To determine whether the adopter districts faithfully replicated the program (Objective 2), a discrepancy analysis was performed by the demonstrator during site visits to each of the eight replicators which implemented the program during the final two project years; i.e., 1980-81 and 1981-82. These analyses were designed to determine the concordance between the actual and proposed program with respect to 28 characteristics: 11 administrative and 17 instructional. The average percentage of concordance for all 28 items across the eight replicators was 93 percent, which surpassed the criterion of 90 percent. In addition, all but one of the replicators was found to meet the 90 percent concordance objective; the exception was a residential facility located in a rural area where it was not possible to implement the program as designed. Thus Objective 2 was largely attained.

The quantity and quality of technical assistance to current replicators was assessed through two additional analyses. First, the intensity of

communications between the demonstrator and current replicators was examined through the tallying of all contacts recorded in the demonstrator's logs. Table 1 presents the numbers and types of contacts recorded. Overall, there were 339 specific contacts between the demonstrator and current replicators. Communication was closely and continuously maintained as indicated by the total of 160 telephone contacts, 93 pieces of correspondence, and 65 meetings.

Second, the quality of training and technical assistance was assessed through the administration of a ten-item questionnaire to all replicator personnel. Respondents used a five-point Likert-type scale, which varied from poor (1) to outstanding (5), to rate the quality of various aspects of the training program; the ten items were as follows:

.Was the purpose of the training made clear to you?
.Was the content or substance of the training program appropriate for you?
.Were the instructions easily understood?
.How effective were the teaching/learning experiences in which you participated?
.How practical was the information you received during training?
.Were the printed materials you received useful resources?
.How well did the information and training you received prepare you to implement the program?
.Did you receive adequate assistance when needed?
.Was technical assistance received during the year beneficial?
.Was the overall implementation of the program successful?

All replicator school districts rated the items either very good or outstanding with the exception of one average response on the appropriateness item, this from the rural-based residential facility mentioned above.

To determine whether the demonstrator provided follow-up assistance to the established replicators (Objective 3), the numbers and types of contacts

TABLE 1

TYPES AND NUMBERS OF COMMUNICATION
BETWEEN DEMONSTRATOR AND
CURRENT REPLICATORS

Program Year	Correspondence	Telephone	Staff Training	Meetings	Contacts
1979-80	19	45	10 Courses	25	99
1980-81	17	40	6 Courses	15	78
1981-82	57	75	5 Courses	25	162
TOTAL	93	160	21 Courses	65	339

TABLE 2

TYPES AND NUMBERS OF COMMUNICATION
BETWEEN DEMONSTRATOR AND
ESTABLISHED REPLICATORS

Program Year	Correspondence	Telephone	Staff Training	Meetings	Contacts
1980-81	9	25	1 Course	5	40
1981-82	35	32	2 Courses	6	75
TOTAL	44	57	3 Courses	11	115

initiated by the demonstrator were ascertained through a review of the project logs (see Table 2). Overall, there were 115 specific contacts between the demonstrator and the established replicators. Communication was continuously and closely maintained as indicated by the total of 57 telephone contacts, 44 pieces of correspondence, and 11 meetings. Each of three districts also received an additional staff-training course. All nine districts continuing replication received assistance. Thus Objective 3 was attained.

V. PROBLEMS

A problem that was encountered during the 1979-80 project year was the failure of some districts to follow through on letters of intent to replicate. However, this problem was largely eliminated and in subsequent years all but one of the districts that filed letters of intent became actual replicators. No other major problems were encountered.

VI. FUTURE ACTIVITIES

This was the fourth and last year of the Travel Training Demonstration Project. However, staff of the New York City Travel Training Program have offered continued assistance to all current and former replicators. In addition, if staffing permits, the newsletter will be continued for the next school year as a means of maintaining contact and sharing information and experiences. Finally, although the demonstration project will have ended, travel training for handicapped students will continue to be provided through the state-validated locally-supported New York City program as well as by locally-supported programs in other districts.

APPENDIX

TYPE AND YEAR OF PARTICIPATION BY
NEW YORK STATE SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS
IN THE TRAVEL TRAINING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

School or District	Letter of Intent	Application	Implementation		
Albany BOCES[a]	80-81	80-81			81-82
Assoc. for the Help of Retarded Citizens	78-79	78-79	79-80		
Bohemia Public Schools	79-80				
Brooklyn School for Special Children	79-80	79-80		80-81	81-82[b]
Buffalo Public Schools	80-81				
Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn	78-79	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82
Crystal Run	80-81[c]				81-82
Fairport BOCES	79-80				
Farmingdale Public Schools	79-80				
Genesee-Wyoming BOCES	80-81	80-81			
Levittown Public Schools	80-81	80-81			81-82
Life Skills School	80-81[c]				81-82
Manhattan Developmental Center	78-79	78-79	79-80		
Newburgh Public Schools	79-80	79-80		80-81	81-82
Plainedge Public Schools	80-81	80-81			81-82
Rochester Public Schools	78-79	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82
Syracuse Public Schools	79-80	79-80		80-81	81-82
Yonkers Public Schools	78-79	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82

[a]Board of Cooperative Educational Services.

[b]The program at this site was terminated in November 1981.

[c]This district elected to support the program by local funds.

NOTE: All of the above schools participated in orientation workshops. In addition, the following 20 schools or school districts requested orientation meetings but did not proceed any further with replication:

- .Archdiocese of New York
- .Archway School
- .Arlene School
- .Batavia Public Schools
- .Blythedale Public Schools
- .Bronx Lebanon Hospital
- .Carey High School
- .Cloverdale School
- .Franklin Square Public Schools
- .Great Neck Public Schools
- .League School
- .Maimonedes School
- .Middletown BOCES
- .Monroe County Department of Traffic Safety
- .Nassau BOCES Kennedy Center
- .Niagara Falls Public Schools
- .Syracuse BOCES
- .Thornwood Public Schools
- .United Cerebral Palsy of Queens
- .Williamsburg Residential Center